

Professional Standards Advisory Board Meetings
November 10, 2010 10am
Minutes Notes

The November 10, 2010 meeting of the Professional Standards Advisory Board was called to order by Jason Woebkenberg, Secretary, at 10 a.m. All board members were in attendance. Mr. Woebkenberg welcomed board members and those in the audience and led attendees in the Pledge of Allegiance. Next, Mr. Woebkenberg moved to approval of the minutes of the September 30, 2010 meeting. Ms. Julian noted that she was not present at that meeting although the minutes indicated all members were present. Dr. Bennett moved and Dr. Johnstone seconded, the approval of the minutes with the correction noting that member Julian was not in attendance. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Woebkenberg noted there were three items of new business on the agenda. The first item of new business was an update on the teacher standards. Mr. Mapes was asked to introduce the topic and update the board. Mr. Mapes reminded the board that the project to update the teaching standards and to align them to the K-12 academic standards started in July. During the rigorous development and review process, over 500 educators around the state and over 100 higher education representatives served as reviewers to help make Indiana's standards some of the best in the nation. Mr. Mapes noted that Dr. Mast played a key role in the process and many Department of Education content specialists also participated. Mr. Mapes explained that the final version of the standards were posted on the public website for viewing on Friday, November 5th and will remain there until just before the December meeting. Because a board member had questioned why the board had to wait until December to approve the standards, Mr. Mapes placed approval of the standards on the "action" agenda in case the board wanted to go ahead and approve the standards. He emphasized that it was entirely up to the board whether to approve the standards now or wait until the December meeting.

Dr. Johnstone questioned the "final" form of the standards and asked if board members were no longer able to make revisions. Mr. Mapes explained that the board members had access to the standards to review and suggest revisions at the same time the standards were being reviewed and revised by other educators. Dr. Johnstone said she was pleased the standards were being revised to support the licensing rules, but she noted that since standards drive everything being done in higher education preparation programs collaboration is very important, especially in areas like the school administrator standards which are radically different. She wants to stick to the original time table that allows additional time for review, discussion and collaboration on the standards as "drafts," rather than taking a final vote today.

Mr. Mapes reiterated that a board member had asked that the board be given the option of taking action today. The documents have been through multiple iterations and they are closely aligned to the student academic standards. However, whether the standards are voted on today is totally up to the board. Dr. Van Horn noted that he had not yet looked at the standards posted on the website and he didn't realize they were already in final form. He wanted a chance to review them before a vote.

Dr. Oliver stated he feels the process that was followed to develop, review and refine the standards was solid; however, he agreed there might be fallout if the board voted earlier than planned since the public might feel the board was moving too fast.

Dr. Bennett moved to table the item until the December 2010 meeting. Dr. Van Horn seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Mr. Mapes emphasized that all 51 standards documents will be on the website for viewing marked as “draft” until the board votes in December.

Dr. Johnstone asked how long the higher education institutions have to put programs in place that are aligned to the new standards. Mr. Mapes responded they will have until September 1, 2013. Dr. Mast indicated the Office of Educator Licensing and Development will publish a schedule for program submittal that will stagger the content area programs.

Mr. Woebkenberg moved to the second agenda item, approval of test scores for the teacher licensing exams. He asked Mr. Mapes to introduce the action item. Mr. Mapes then turned the presentation over to Dr. Mast. She noted that the scores she had proposed and recommended at the September meeting were posted on the OELD website for comment for 30 days and very few comments were submitted. She proposed that 9-1-2011 be the effective date for the scores on tests that were new, reviewed, and regenerated. This date corresponds well to the reporting year for higher education programs and works well for students who are beginning programs under REPA in 9-2011; applicants for licensure could begin using the new scores in May 2011, once six months has passed. Ms. Riehl asked about what tests students must take if they were still completing a Rules 2002 program. Discussion ensued, with Ms. Regnier explaining that students who pass the appropriate test while enrolled in an approved program do not have to meet a new testing requirement that may be effective at the time of licensure. The new tests and scores will not apply retroactively against students already in approved programs. The new scores will raise the bar for students accepted into programs prospectively. Dr. Mast also indicated that there may be a transition period where students will have a choice to take the “old” test or the “new” test.

Dr. Mast explained that the new elementary education test will look different and will be longer; it will generate separate language arts and math scores. The Reading Specialist test will be eliminated since it is not a valid assessment for elementary education reading. Ms. Riehl asked about the cost of the longer elementary education test; during discussion it was noted that elementary education majors will no longer be taking 2 tests, so the cost to the test taker will be less. However, teachers taking the current elementary education test will still need to pass the separate reading test until the new elementary education test is fully implemented. Dr. Mast suggested the board act on the new, reviewed, and regenerated tests first before acting on the Praxis I alternatives. Dr. Johnstone moved and Dr. Oliver seconded. Ms. Julian questioned the FACS score, which appeared to change drastically. Dr. Mast explained that the test is now scored on a completely different scale. A question was asked as to whether the social studies composite test (#0081) currently in use would still be available. Dr. Mast responded that after the new test scores for the separate social studies areas become effective, the composite test would no longer be used. Dr. Van Horn asked whether there need to be separate middle school science and social studies tests. Dr. Mast confirmed they are needed since there is a separate middle school license for those content areas. Dr. Van Horn asked about the French test and whether it included “production,” which is a speaking section. Dr. Mast and Ms. Bosworth from ETS confirmed that production is embedded in the new world language tests. Mr. Woebkenberg called for a vote on the motion and second to approve the scores for the new, reviewed, and regenerated tests. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Mast moved on to discuss the proposed Praxis I alternatives. She recommended the adoption of the recommendations she presented in September and that had been posted on the website for comment. Her recommendations were: MS degree; ACT score of 22; SAT score of 1100; GRE scores of 1100; Praxis I composite score of 527. Dr. Johnstone clarified

that the SAT and GRE tests include verbal and quantitative (math) sections. Mr. Zoeller suggested the ACT score be 24 instead of 22 in order to better correlate to the score of 1100 on the SAT. Dr. Van Horn asked about correlating the two exams, since the SAT includes an essay. Mr. Zoeller explained that the ACT subtests are math, reading, grammar and science reasoning; there is no writing included. In order to correlate scores between the SAT and ACT, only the SAT math and critical reading sections should be considered. Dr. Van Horn questioned how the SAT and ACT can be correlated if they don't have the same subtests. Mr. Zoeller stated that it was common for high school counselors and administrators to use a chart to correlate the scores of the two exams when looking at student scholarship eligibility. Dr. Mast confirmed that The College Board completed a correlation study between the SAT and ACT and found that a score of 24 on the ACT correlated to a score of 1100 on the SAT. Mr. Zoeller moved, and Dr. Oliver seconded, that the Praxis I alternatives be approved as recommended except with an ACT score of 24 rather than 22. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Wuebkenberg moved to the next item of new business: presentation of the Masters in Educational Leadership program from American College of Education (ACE). Mr. Mapes introduced the action item, noting that ACE was seeking approval of its program in Indiana for the purpose of leading to licensure as a building level administrator. Mr. Mapes drew the board members' attention to the executive summary of the ACE program they were provided in advance. He introduced Dr. Vernon Johnson, Executive Vice President, to begin the presentation. Dr. Johnson explained that ACE is a private college in Illinois with HLC accreditation and licensed to do business in Illinois. He introduced the President of ACE, Dr. Jeri Nowakowski; Dean, Dr. Dennis Gooler; Associate Dean, Dr. Ken Jandis. Dr. Johnson explained that ACE currently has about 3800 students in graduate programs only, representing 42 states. Dr. Johnson noted that he was from Indiana and he spent 18 years of his education career here in three school districts.

Dr. Nowakowski addressed the board and gave some background about her career and ACE. She is familiar with Indiana since at one time she was in charge of the North Central Regional Education Lab in which Indiana participated. Dr. Nowakowski explained that ACE has a unique market niche and it does not generally compete for students with traditional institutions. The goal of the founders of ACE was to develop a means for education practitioners to obtain graduate degrees that were affordable, convenient and relevant. The mission of ACE was to invest in technology rather than "bricks and mortar" to deliver programs. Program design focuses on current research and the effectiveness of technology and student achievement. A majority of ACE's students are from urban or rural areas where accessibility and affordability of graduate programs are needs.

Dean Schooler presented an overview of the ACE masters in Educational Leadership program, explaining the courses, duration, online learning platform, instructor interaction with students, assignments and internships, all designed to emphasize student engagement. The program consists of 12 courses, each lasting 5 weeks. Students take one course at a time. During each course, students are assessed an average of 30 times in multiple ways. ACE uses technology to the greatest degree possible to facilitate class discussions and student-instructor contact. The faculty at ACE consists of over 100 professors recruited nation-wide; in the Education Leadership program all professors but one have doctoral degrees and all are highly regarded in their areas of expertise. Due to the online design of the curriculum, ACE has the ability--and is committed--to tailor programs to meet the preparation and licensure requirements of multiple states.

Associate Dean Jandis explained the rigorous internship/field experience that is required in the program and spoke about how the field experiences flow through the required courses. The internship actively involves the candidate, the candidate's mentor or supervisor (who is vetted by ACE) and the internship professor. The focus of the internship activities is three-fold: school/community leadership, instructional leadership and administrative leadership.

Mr. Woebkenberg asked for a clarification of the board action. Dr. Mast explained that as part of the executive summary document she recommended the board's action be approval of the program. Dr. Oliver asked how the 5 weeks courses correlate to credit hours. The courses roughly equate to 3 semester hours; the entire program equates to about 48 quarter hours or 33-36 semester hours. During each 5 week course the students have between 25 and 30 hours of instructor contact.

Dr. Johnstone noted that she did not see an in-depth assessment of the ability to use data and the teaching of teachers to use data. The Dean responded that there is a formal course required called Informed Research that focuses on utilization of data and research. In addition, many of the course assignments are based around research and data collection and the application of data. Dr. Johnstone then asked how ACE is going to align its program to Indiana's new standards. Dr. Johnson reiterated that since ACE is digital it has the capacity to move quickly to revise courses to meet changing standards. ACE tailors its programs to meet the standards of each state in which it operates. Customer service and customization are strengths of ACE.

Mr. Woebkenberg asked what a student sees when he or she logs in to take a course. The Dean described the experience from the student point of view and explains there is a lot of support for students to ensure they stay on track and that any issues they have are addressed. ACE has a 93% retention rate with students completing their graduate programs "on time" in 18 months. Dr. Van Horn asked how ACE does follow-up on its graduates. Dr. Johnson responded that follow-up is challenging for all institutions; however, ACE is working with Chicago Public Schools and Clay County, FL schools where there are significant ACE graduates employed to conduct an organized follow-up process. Ms. Riehl asked if the several-hundred page full program submission covered details about faculty qualifications and student financial support. Dean Gooler assured the board that faculty qualifications were covered in detail in the full report, just not in the executive summary the board received. Dr. Nowakowski responded that since ACE accepts no Title 4 dollars, there is no student loan data to report. Most ACE students pay for their full masters program up front with a credit card. Ms. Riehl asked the cost of the masters program and was told it is \$6,950. Ms. Riehl asked how ACE computed its completion data and made projections for completion. Dr. Nowakowski explained the masters program has been in existence since 2005, so no long term data is available, but data is gathered by cohort.

Following additional discussion, Dr. Bennett moved and Mr. Zoeller seconded that the ACE Masters in Educational Leadership program be approved. The motion passed unanimously. A suggestion was made that ACE return at a future meeting to demonstrate the learning platform used by ACE to deliver its courses. Dr. Van Horn asked that for future program approvals the executive summary be a discussion item at one meeting and the vote on the program be an action item the following month.

Mr. Woebkenberg reminded board members that the next meeting is December 21st at 10 a.m. Adjournment was moved and seconded. The meeting adjourned at 11:31 a.m.